

## **REMARKS**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 29, 2009. Claims 1-66 and 68 and 69 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-66 and 68 and 69. The present Response amends claims 34-35, 39-54, 58-66, and 68-69, and adds new claim 70-72, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-66, and 68. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

### **A. Claims Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1-66, and 68-69 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Witwer et al. (US 2004/0098360) in view of Popp et al. (US 6,249,291).

#### **Claim 34**

Claim 34 has been amended to further state the portlet as *“using an interchangeable lifecycle driver to drive the logical hierarchy through a sequence of states, wherein the interchangeable lifecycle driver isolates lifecycle driver implementation details from a container of the logical hierarchy and allows different lifecycle implementations to be interchanged.”*

Witwer discloses a user-created life portal for viewing and accessing contents that is specifically tailored to meet the target interests and preferences of a user and is designed to exclude content not of interest to the user (Abstract).

Popp discloses an object-oriented approach that provides the ability to develop and manage Internet transaction (Abstract).

Applicant respectfully submits that Witwer and other prior art do not teach or make obvious that an interchangeable lifecycle driver can drive the logical hierarchy through a sequence of states.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 34, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim 50**

Claim 50, while independently patentable, recites limitations similar to Claim 34 and is not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 35-49, 51-66 and 68**

Claims 35-49, 51-66 and 68 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

#### **Claim 70**

Newly added Claim 70 depends on Claim 34. In addition Claim 70 also includes a feature of *“mapping one or more tag extensions into the logical hierarchy when the logical hierarchy is rendered, wherein the one or more tag extensions represent at least one control in the logical hierarchy, and wherein at least one tag extension can locate a metadata description of the logical hierarchy and create the logical hierarchy.”*

Applicant respectfully submits that Witwer and other prior art do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 70 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 71 and 72**

Newly added Claims 71 and 72 depend on Claim 34. In addition, Claim 72 includes a feature of *“using a streaming control tree factory to create the control tree from an XML stream, wherein the streaming control tree factory can map each user into an individual control stream and regenerate the control tree if the XML stream changes.”*

Applicant respectfully submits that Witwer and other prior art do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 71 and 72 are neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

## **B. Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 29, 2009

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/

Kuiran (Ted) Liu

Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800